

Reply to Office Action of November 01, 2004

The Examiner considers that 'the process can be used with a materially different product, such as wheat flour'. However, pending claim 1 is drawn to 'a process for extracting and refining the components of **pea flour**'. Moreover, the recitation of claim 1 includes a step, wherein flour is prepared '**by grinding dry peas**'. Therefore, the process of claim 1 cannot be used with wheat flour, and inventions I and III are not distinct.

In addition, those skilled in the art are well aware of the fact that each kind of starch (potato, wheat, corn ...) requires **specifically adapted devices** for its manufacture. It was absolutely **unknown**, that pieces of equipment from a **potato** starch factory can be used to manufacture **any other product**, not to mention **pea** starch.

Inventions I and II are not distinct, since pending claim 9 is drawn to a device 'for extracting and refining the components of **pea flour**', which can be used in the process of pending claim 1.

It is thus respectfully requested that the above cited restriction requirement be withdrawn.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the actions on the merits should be carried out on claims 1-13.

Respectfully submitted,

Jean-Paul SALOME et al

Nov. 29, 2004

Date

By:

Michael O. Sturm

Michael O. Sturm

Reg. No. 26,078

STURM & FIX LLP

206 Sixth Avenue, Suite 1213

Des Moines, Iowa 50309-4076

Telephone: (515) 288-9589

Telefax: (515) 288-5311